DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 991 SO 014 107

AUTHOR Tucker, Jan L.
TITLE Our Global Future: Implications for Social Studies Education in the United States.
PUB DATE Jun 82
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Social Science Education Consortium (East Lansing, MI, June 2-5, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Civil Liberties; College Role; Developed Nations; Developing Nations; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; *Futures (of Society); *Global Approach; Higher Education; *Social Studies; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to probe the relationship between the emerging global context of life for citizens in the United States and the further development of the field of social studies. The paper first examines the concept of the world problematique, described as the sudden realization of the world as a global system with complex problems and no apparent solutions. There is a global revolution of rising expectations worldwide which contains both hope and despair. The hope springs mainly from within developing nations, where the majority of people are striving to attain a minimal level of physical and psychological security. Typically, the despair emanates from those in the already industrialized nations who see an inevitable clash between modernization and the reality of finite resources, and who may also believe that the only conceivable solutions to this dilemma will destroy the political, social, and cultural freedoms known in the industrialized nations of the West. For social studies educators in the United States, the dilemma of modernization versus finite resources raises agonizing questions. For example, shall social studies choose to foster the precepts and concepts of the now burgeoning revolution of rising expectations? Or shall it choose to emphasize the realities of finite resources, thereby allying itself with the more conservative voices? As an illustration of a productive framework, the paper discusses how global education with an international human rights content might raise an opportunity for these questions to be given a fair hearing. The paper concludes by urging stronger leadership from colleges and universities for social studies education with a world view. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED216991

Our Global Future: Implications for Social Studies Education in the United States

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jan L. Tucker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Jan L. Tucker
Professor
School of Education
Florida International University
Tamiami Campus
Miami, Florida 33199

SO 014 107

Annual Meeting of the Social Science Education Consortium
"Curriculum Theory and Social Science Education"
Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan
June 2 - 5, 1982

Table of Contents

The World Problematique 3

The Global Revolution of Rising Expectations 3

Implications of the Revolution of Rising Expectations 4

Cultural Parity 6

Finite Resources 7

The World Problematique and Social Studies in the United States 9

Dare the Social Studies Help to Build a New World Order? 9

The Emerging Global Context for Social Studies in the United States . . . 11

The Challenge for Social Studies 13

The Contribution of International Human Rights 14

International Human Rights are in the National Interest 14

International Human Rights as a Normative Framework for Global Education 15

The Potential of the 1974 UNESCO Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace, and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms 16

The Critical Role of Higher Education 18

Programs at the College and University Level 20

A Fresh Approach to Teacher Education 21

Postscript 23

Notes

Introduction

There is a need for each generation to redefine its history. The past, as Herbert J. Muller has suggested, has many uses.[1] One use of history is to provide humankind with a world view that makes sense at a given period of time. Today, we are moving into an era of rapid change and severe dislocations characterized by events, problems, and opportunities on a global scale. Lee Anderson's historical analysis has led him to the conclusion that the new circumstances are pushing us to a paradigm change in our consciousness at least equal to the magnitude of the Copernican Revolution.[2] Leften Stavrianos adds to our new global view by pointing out that the "Third World," defined as a set of unequal relationships among nations and peoples, began not, as commonly assumed, during the post World War Two era in Africa, Latin America, and Asia, but in the sixteenth century in Eastern Europe, and grew to maturity in the era of monopoly capitalism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[3]

This global system, where many decisions now affect all the world's actors, requires a global view and a global approach to the fundamental assumptions and research and development efforts of social studies education in the United States. "Global education," according to the National Council for the Social Studies, "needs to be viewed as part of the foundation of social studies education and as being more fundamentally important than a mere addition to the curriculum."[4] Thus, a global perspective is as important in considerations of the aims and purposes of social studies as it is a desirable outcome of instruction in social studies. Social studies designed with a global view and sweep can be a humanistic, liberating discipline and has much to offer a revitalized Weltanschauung to serve us in the twenty-first century.

Social studies in the United States was seen by many who helped lay its foundation as a means for social reconstruction. But today, social studies appears to lie in the eddies, and not the mainstream of intellectual thinking. In the 1970s, social studies in the United States turned sharply away from reflective thinking, social issues, inquiry, and interdisciplinary approaches -- all of which were hallmarks of a social studies that looked to the future and to the possibility of helping shape a new social order. However, education in preparation for a new paradigm change is, by definition, education to help build a new world view and a social order to fit that world view.

The purpose of this paper is to probe the relationship between the emerging global context of life for citizens in the United States and the further development of the field of social studies. The paper is directed to an audience of social studies educators who believe that a global education is not simply a slogan, but that a global age does indeed require a global education. The history of the field is important insofar as it reveals data related to its revitalized purpose and fresh questions. A more satisfactory definition of the field of social studies, a nagging problem, will follow eventually from its reconstructed assumptions and purpose.

The paper examines the concept of <u>the world problematique</u>, then identifies difficult choices for social studies education within a global perspective, employs international human rights as an illustration of a productive framework, and concludes by urging stronger leadership from colleges and universities for social studies education with a world view.

The World Problematique

The Club of Rome uses the phrase the world problematique to describe the sudden realization of a world as a global system with complex problems and no apparent solutions.[5] Following a period of general optimism of the 1950s and 1960s, it appears not only that the world condition has substantially deteriorated but that adverse trends are steadily strengthening.

A major turning point in human history has been reached. Where does the United States stand at this juncture? With 6 percent of the world's population, the United States controls 30 percent of the world's energy resources. Within the United States, 20 percent of the people control 40 percent of the wealth.[6] Therefore, the national elite in the United States is tantamount to a global elite.

The Global Revolution of Rising Expectations*

Almost two decades ago, Robert Heilbroner brought to our attention that a global revolution of rising human expectations -- the hope for a better material, political, and spiritual life -- was well underway and represented a significant event in human history. Indeed, this revolution of rising expectations, or the Great Ascent, as Heilbroner called it, is now considered as one of the first clearly recognizable examples of the J-curve phenomenon. Thus, the rapid increase in human aspirations during the twentieth century may be conceived in terms of exponential growth. Heilbroner described its magnitude, its attractions, and its importance for the future:

---

*This section has been adapted from a chapter by the author, "Social Studies in the United States - Global Challenges," in Social Studies in Other Nations, H. Mehlinger and J. Tucker, editors, pp. 91-101.

> It is not mere rhetoric to speak of this Great Ascent as the first real act of world history. Certainly in size and scope it towers over any previous enterprise . . . . For over one hundred nations, economic development means a chance to become a national entity, to live in the chronicle of recorded events. For over two billion human beings, it means something at once humbler and infinitely more important: the chance to become a personal entity, simply to live. And over and beyond this immense impact of development on the lives which are being led today looms its incalculably larger impact on the lives to be led tomorrow.[7]

The revolution of rising expectations is without precedent. It is global in scope. It will generate changes which now are only perceived dimly, but which for the future will pose enormous challenges, especially for the developed nations of the world -- and for social studies educators who represent the developed nations.

Implications of the Revolution of Rising Expectations

During the two decades since Heilbroner collected and synthesized the material for his book, The Great Ascent: The Struggle for Economic Development in Our Time, events have confirmed his major thesis that, indeed, the vision of a better life is one of the most powerful motivating global forces of the twentieth century. While the gap between rich and poor nations continues to exist, and is viewed by some as a problem even more serious than before,[8] the modernization process has spread around the globe and has engendered some remarkable successes, perhaps most notably in Japan.

Edwin Reischauer argues that the modernization breakthrough in Japan is a convincing indicator that the achievement of a better material life is not the sole province of the Western world.[9] Today, Japan serves as a prototype demonstrating that modernization is not only an aspiration of global magnitude, but also that it can become a global reality. Within a few decades, the dream

may be achieved in other nations, such as Nigeria, Iran, Brazil, Mexico, and the People's Republic of China.

Any doubts that remained about the power wielded by the revolution of human expectations were considerably diminished by China's announcement of its intention to modernize by the year 2000. In 1978, a billboard in Shanghai read "Take advantage of every minute, every second, to race to the year 2000." This slogan represents the quintessence of this revolution and stands as a symbol of the twentieth century.

The global revolution of rising expectations is more than merely an elevation of the material standard of living. Attendant to the improved physical well-being are increases in political, economic, and social freedoms. The most widely accepted expression of these fundamental freedoms is found in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted and proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948. The heart of the Declaration is contained in its first Article, which reads: "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood." The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, together with the United Nations Charter and the related international covenants, conventions, and declarations, constitute what has become known as the International Bill of Human Rights and comprise an important statement in the literature describing the revolution of rising expectations.[10]

The temporal, spatial, and moral dimensions that comprise the revolution of rising expectations have acted to set loose global forces which together will change the face of world relationships. It is in the context of this change that social studies in the United States may face its toughest challenge, an issue which we will return to later. But first, two of these global forces

will be introduced and briefly examined.

Cultural Parity. Initially, in Northern Europe and the United States, and later elsewhere in the Western world, the revolution of rising expectations has been accompanied, in general, by a parallel belief of cultural superiority. It was taken for granted in the West that modernization and cultural dominance went hand-in-hand and that both were today, and would remain tomorrow, the special province of the early industrial nations. Today, as modernization spreads over the globe, this assumption is being challenged.

The UNESCO Conference on Cultural Parity, planned for the early 1980s, symbolizes the fact of a Western world being forced to leave behind the anachronistic attitude of "cultural disdain" and face up to the reality that the world of the twenty-first century is not being made over in the Western image. Even today's technological outcomes attributed to the revolution of rising expectations in all probability will differ from those that would be familiar to the West. For example, Japan has managed to avoid the worst aspects of labor-management conflict by embodying the concept of a corporation into the traditional Japanese ideas of family responsibility. Once a Japanese worker is hired into a company, he or she becomes "family" and is taken care of for life. Japanese corporations take seriously their social responsibility to develop human resources and consider it a condition necessary to producing quality products.

A recent policy that manifests the emerging cultural parity concept is the position of the United States on the mass media resolution adopted at the 1978 UNESCO General Conference in Paris. The United States had three options: (1) to fight against any declaration; (2) to fight to the bitter end for a full-blown freedom of information declaration; or (3) to negotiate a consensus declaration that sacrificed as little as possible on freedom of information and, at the same

time, gave credence to the position of Third World nations which preferred more governmental control of the mass media. The United States delegation chose to follow the third strategy and, after hard negotiation, helped forge the consensus Declaration on the Mass Media. The significance of this agreement is that, early in the negotiation, the United States decided to accept the idea of cultural parity in an international forum and worked for consensus.[11]

The United States is entering a new era of international decision-making and cannot afford either to be dogmatic on policy matters or disdainful of other cultures. Cultural parity, consensus assumptions, and multinational participation are very likely to become the basic ingredients of international decision-making. Social studies education in the United States needs to absorb these new global realities.

Finite Resources. During the 1970s, it became clear that the resources of Earth, especially fossil fuels, are in danger of being depleted if present trends of population growth and consumption come anywhere close to their predicted growth rates. For example, even with the discovery of new oil fields in Mexico and China, severe shortages of petroleum are expected to appear within the next decade. The global revolution of rising expectations is predicated on the assumption that available resources, especially energy resources, will stay apace with increasing demand.

A dilemma has developed: rising expectations versus finite resources. Rising expectations represent perhaps the most powerful burst of optimism in the twentieth century. The recent recognition that resources are finite represents an equally powerful realization of the limits to rising expectations. The consequences of the collision between the dream and the reality are yet to unfold.

Robert Heilbroner warns, "No developing country has fully confronted the

implications of becoming a 'modern' nation-state whose industrial development must be severely limited . . . ."[12] He is pessimistic about the capacity of peoples and nations to negotiate successfully the challenges which lie ahead. He writes:

> ...In all likelihood we must brace ourselves for the consequences ... the risk of 'wars of redistribution' or of 'pre-emptive seizure,' the rise of social tensions in the industrialized nations over the division of an ever more slow-growing or even diminishing product, and the prospect of a far more coercive exercise of national power as the means by which we will attempt to bring these disruptive processes under control. From that period of harsh adjustment, I can see no realistic escape ... If, then, by the question, 'Is there hope for man?' we ask whether it is possible to meet the challenges of the future without the payment of a fearful price, the answer must be: No, there is no such hope.[13]

In summary, the global revolution of rising expectations contains both hope and despair. The hope springs mainly from within the developing nations where the majority of people are striving to attain a minimal level of physical and psychological security. Typically, the despair emanates from those in the already industrialized nations who see an inevitable clash between modernization and the reality of finite resources, and who may also believe that the only conceivable solutions to this dilemma, short of wars of extermination, will destroy the political, social, and cultural freedoms known in the industrialized nations of the West.

For social studies educators in the United States, the dilemma of modernization versus finite resources raises agonizing questions.

The World Problematique and Social Studies in the United States

Shall social studies choose to foster the precepts and concepts of the now burgeoning revolution of rising expectations, thereby helping to build a new social order conceived on a global scale? Or, shall it choose to emphasize the realities of finite resources, thereby potentially allying itself with the more conservative voices, whose most strident defenders would have the United States adopt a "lifeboat" philosophy?

Dare the Social Studies Help to Build a New World Order?

In 1932, George S. Counts, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, published a pamphlet entitled Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?[14] The challenge was issued to steer educators in the United States toward the idea of using schools for the reconstruction of society. Counts was also a member of the American Historical Association's Commission on the Social Studies in the Schools, which included among its sixteen-person membership such notables as Charles A. Beard, Avery O. Craven, Carlton J. H. Hayes, Ernest Horn, Henry Johnson, Charles E. Merriam, and Jesse Newlon. Counts himself wrote one of the Commission's volumes, The Social Foundations of American Education. The seventeen volumes published by the AHA Commission on the Social Studies in the Schools are considered to be key contributions to the larger progressive education movement.[15]

The question of the role of schooling in social reconstruction was a corollary of a larger intellectual ferment of the 1930s which concerned the social role of organized knowledge.[16] Given the explosion of knowledge in almost every field of inquiry and the deteriorating economic, social, and political conditions of the times, scholars were perplexed about the role of the organized disciplines.

One form of the argument resided in the issues of whether knowledge was better offered within the discipline specializations or whether it was better integrated and synthesized. A second issue was knowledge for its own sake versus knowledge applied to the solution of social problems. The AHA Commission on Social Studies in the Schools came down solidly for both the integration and application of scholarly disciplines. By the mid-1930s, the intellectual leadership of the social studies indeed appeared to believe that education should be used to create a new social order and that social studies ought to play a leading role.

Intellectual ferment was one thing; what was happening in the schools was another. The Counts agenda was never adopted; in fact, not many classroom teachers read it in the first place.[17] In 1939, Robert S. Lynd published Knowledge for What?[18] This was perhaps the last strong plea, prior to the Second World War, for the social application of the social sciences.

World War II and its Cold War aftermath created a new era. Progressive education and its goal of education for social reconstruction could not survive the forbidding intellectual climate. Indeed, progressive education was viewed in some circles as the major culprit for the ills of American education in the 1950s. The era came to a close when the Progressive Education Association disbanded in 1955.[19]

Today, the few remaining second-generation social reconstructionists are disillusioned and some now question the original assumptions which undergirded the ferment of the 1920s and 1930s and, in turn, provided the intellectual impulse for their own social studies curriculum development work in the 1960s. For example, Donald Oliver, principal architect of the Harvard Project Social Studies, now contends that the hopes of early social studies reconstructionists, like Harold Rugg, were naive and that their belief in formal schooling as the vanguard of

social reform is not supported by the facts.[20]

According to Oliver, the good life in a secular democratic state is defined by standards of gross national product, employment and health statistics, and, generally, a counting up of goods and services. He suggests that this materialistic belief system may so fragment life that people lose touch with the "world whole, as a single moral order with interrelated values and assumptions." It is this quest for a "world whole" that provides the renewed spark for asking "Dare the Social Studies Help to Build a New World Order?"

The Emerging Global Context for Social Studies in the United States

Donald Oliver's plea for a "world whole" represents a clear-cut example of the increasing realization by an expanding range of American social studies educators that a global context is a much-needed dimension for rethinking the purposes and the practices of social studies education in the United States. Some social studies educators may disagree with Oliver on whether the concept of "world whole" should be defined as a "single moral order." But such disagreements should not obscure the fact that the need for holistic structures has been identified and that the intellectual search process is underway.

The major theme unifying this new inquiry has two aspects: (1) social studies education, as now conceived in the United States, is inadequate to prepare our youth for the challenges and the opportunities of the emerging global age; and (2) social studies needs a global perspective infused into its traditional and ongoing function of citizenship education.

Global trends, such as growing economic interdependence, an increasing awareness of our common origins, and a shared sense of human destiny, are challenging the thinking of social studies educators in the United States.

There is an increasing recognition that our nation-centered citizen education needs to be reconstructed to prepare for a world where an ever-growing number of problems are beyond the capacity of individual nations to resolve. It is likely that this trend will be welcomed by other nations and cultures that are concerned that citizens of the United States are ill-informed about world politics and that are apprehensive about such ignorance, especially in a powerful democratic nation where public opinion can sway foreign policy decisions.[21]

Social studies education in the United States reconceived within the emerging global context will require universal, global concepts to achieve the "world whole" sought by Oliver. Toward this end, Lee Anderson has identified the J-curve.[22] James Becker has suggested the concept of human inclusiveness and the relative lack of concern for the national origins of ideas.[23] Robert Leestma calls for a development of the values of intergenerational stewardship -- the capacity of one generation to make policy decisions based on the welfare of future generations.[24] Thomas Buergenthal and Judith Torney urge that a greater attention be devoted to the concept of international human rights.[25] Robert Johns argues that the notion of "man-in-dialogue" is important to an understanding of global processes.[26] Robert Hanvey has described several dimensions required to achieve a global perspective.[27]

Taken in the aggregate, these formulations represent a substantial effort among educators to develop an enriched new configuration of social studies based upon a global perspective. The task of social studies in the United States is to organize curriculum materials and instructional objectives so that students may have more opportunities to gain a global perspective and to learn why doing so is in their self-interest. A momentum is developing; rarely now does one find strong support at the cutting edge for nation-centered citizenship education.

The Challenge for Social Studies

Education for a global perspective is, by definition, education conceived as an agent for social change and reconstruction. Any decision to incorporate a global perspective into the social studies curriculum, however, will be followed in a few years by the issue of which particular perspective should be adopted. It is naive to assume that only one global perspective will emerge. Choices will be made. Conceivably, social studies in the United States (qua global education and social reconstruction) could follow one of at least two directions. One direction is consistent with the worldwide revolution of rising human expectations and supports the fundamental tenets of improved physical, psychological, and moral life for all of Earth's peoples and nations. Another direction, based upon the assumption of finite resources, could conceivably (but not necessarily) take a hard line toward the poor nations and the poor within the industrialized nations. The pressure for social studies to choose the latter may well become even more compelling as events in the world run counter to national interests as perceived by the majority of citizens.

Education for a global perspective cannot be entered into lightly in a nation where, historically, attitudes toward the rest of the world have often been superior, negative, and isolationist. Social studies educators in the United States who have positive attitudes toward education for a global perspective must be sensitive to these realities and to the consequences of the potential range of future choices. In the final analysis, social studies education qua social reconstruction will be judged on the particulars, not the generalities, of global education.

The Contribution of International Human Rights*

The interdependent world of rising expectations requires that we deal with other nations and people on an increasing basis of cultural reciprocity and equality in recognizing and dealing with the global, political, economic, social and cultural issues which are important to them. The standards governing these issues and procedures are embedded in the International Bill of Human Rights;* the decision-making mechanisms for protecting these rights are found in international and regional organizations, such as the United Nations, UNESCO, the Council of Europe, and the Organization of American States.

International Human Rights are in the National Interest

In an important speech delivered at Harvard University's 1980 commencement, Cyrus R. Vance, former United States Sectetary of State, described the world of the 1980s as one of rapid change, growing expectations, better education, quickened communications and diffused international power and intellect. It will be a world in which yesterday's answers will not provide tomorrow's solutions. Certain fallacies must be exploded. One of the myths that must be destroyed, according to Vance, ". . . is that there is an incompatability between the pursuit of America's values in our foreign policy, such as human rights, and the pursuit of our interests."[28]

People all over the world want to have economic security, to live in dignity, and to be free from fear, from police arrest, and from torture. They want human rights. It is in our historic tradition and national interest for

---

*This section has been adapted from a chapter by the author to appear in a forthcoming Bulletin of NCSS on International Human Rights Education, ed., M. Branson and J. Torney-Purta.

citizens of the United States to identify with these universal aspirations codified in the International Bill of Human Rights.

International Human Rights as a Normative Framework for Global Education

The development of a global perspective per se, as stated earlier, will not necessarily bring with it a commitment to human dignity, social and economic justice, and cultural parity throughout the world. The pressure to maintain or even increase the current imbalance of resource production, distribution, and consumption -- at any and all costs -- may be compelling. Another scenario, one more consistent with the values expressed in the International Bill of Human Rights, is sympathy with the global revolution of rising human expectations in both its material and ethical realms. It is this latter path that former Secretary Vance recommended we follow and one which has widespread support among members of both political parties.

Global education without the benefit of the content of international human rights, or a similar world view, even within the social studies tradition of reflective inquiry, can avoid many of the tough questions that lie in front of us. In the face of global undernourishment and periodic starvation, for example, shall food be considered a commodity to be bought, sold, or withheld for profit, or shall it be a basic human right? Shall individuals as well as nations have the right to register complaints concerning violations of human rights? Shall the population problem in the world be viewed as at least partially a problem of overconsumption of scarce resources? Shall human rights violations in one nation be criticized by another nation in the name of national rivalry or in the name of universal principles?

Global education with international human rights content does not ensure

adequate solutions to these complex questions, but it does provide an opportunity for the questions to be given a fair hearing. The International Bill of Human Rights can provide a normative framework for dealing with the content of global education by affirming the fact, not just the wish, that there is international consensus about certain basic human attributes and rights.

The Potential of the 1974 UNESCO Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace, and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

The close relationship between global education and international human rights was recognized and confirmed in 1974 when UNESCO adopted the Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace, and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The 1974 UNESCO Recommendation defined human rights and fundamental freedoms as those found in the United Nations Charter and International Bill of Human Rights. Reflecting the close relationship between human rights and education, its recommendations for the content of the new education called for the study of:

(a) the equality of rights of people, and the rights of people to self-determination;

(b) the maintenance of peace . . . ;

(c) action to ensure the exercise and observance of human rights . . . ;

(d) economic growth and social development and the relation to social justice . . . ;

(e) the use, management, and conservation of natural resources . . . ;

(f) the preservation of the cultural heritage of mankind; and

(g) the role and methods of action of the United Nations system in solving problems and possibilities fpr strengthening and furthering its action.[29]

Clearly, so far as UNESCO is concerned, human rights are at the heart of education

for a global perspective.

The 1974 UNESCO Recommendation provides a set of guiding principles for the development of global education programs internationally, regionally, and nationally. In September 1978, UNESCO sponsored an International Congress on the Teaching of Human Rights in Vienna, Austria. The final document of the Vienna Congress urged that UNESCO create a six-year plan for the development of programs, research studies, materials, and implementation strategies. In June 1979, a group of experts under UNESCO's sponsorship drafted a long-range plan which was brought before the twenty-first UNESCO General Conference held in Belgrade, Yugoslavia in November 1980. Included in the six-year plan is the creation of an international clearinghouse for teaching human rights and for exchange of specialized research, as well as curricula and the existing courses in the field of human rights at all levels of education. Also on the agenda for the 1980s are working conferences, research, preparation of materials, and the study of new methods for teaching about human rights. A major UNESCO conference is scheduled in 1982 for the purpose of reviewing accomplishments of the 155 member states with regard to the 1974 Recommendation. The 1980s should be a fruitful period for international human rights education in a global context, and universities have an opportunity to be at its forefront.

The Critical Role of Higher Education

It is in the colleges and universities located in the United States where the great majority of the global elite are being educated, including more than 300,000 foreign students. The policies and programs affecting the world's common global future are being shaped today in American colleges and universities. These institutions of higher education are appropriately conceived as a global resource.

The record of colleges and universities in the United States in providing leadership in teaching, research, and scholarship to sope with the world problematique is discouraging. The curriculum of higher education is fragmented and only rarely includes interdisciplinary approaches to global issues. Most university leaders, from presidents to instructors, have had only very limited international experiences. Frequently, the competitive reward system of higher education causes faculty to disregard international interests because "there are more important things to study."[30]

The following facts underscore the problem in higher education:[31]

- Less than 1 percent of the college-aged group in the United States is enrolled in any courses which specifically feature international issues or areas.
- Only about 1 percent of college and university faculty members go abroad each year.
- Of the ten million students enrolled in higher education in the United States, only 1 to 2 percent participate in study programs abroad.
- Fewer than 5 percent of the teachers being trained today have had any exposure whatsoever to international, comparative, area and other intercultural courses in the work for certification.

Some positive efforts are underway. During the last half of the 1970s and early 1980s, education for a global perspective, including international human rights, was poised for a takeoff. In 1979, the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies issued its final report and called for increased funding for interational education at all levels.[32] Several states, including Michigan, Illinois, New York, New Jersey and Florida issues guidelines encouraging global education program development, and supported pilot demonstration projects.[33] In December 1980, Congress passed a strong resolution favoring increased emphasis on foreign language and international studies.[34]

Although the effect of the current federal budget austerity on international education is discouraging, it seems certain that many of the seeds planted at the grass roots and in national professional organizations during the 1970s will grow and bear fruit during the 1980s.[35] The Education and World View Project (of The Council on Learning) is one of the major forces working to bring a global perspective to the curriculum of higher education in the United States. The World View project bases its approach on the assumption that "academic institutions . . . must tilt towards the larger moments of human history."[36]

Education for a global perspective, which has achieved its greatest visibility at the pre-collegiate level, represents a significant force for change in higher education. Indeed, the long term viability of higher education in the United States as a shaper of global futures may hinge on whether these institutions of higher education can become more globally-minded to better serve both our own citizens and the 300,000+ foreign students. Colleges and universities in the United States should be at the vanguard of the change process in bringing a global view to social studies education. International human rights has an important contribution to make.

Programs at the College and University Level

According to a 1979 survey of law and social science faculties of colleges and universities in the United States, there is considerable interest in higher education in the field of international human rights. In terms, however, of actual courses being offered dealing primarily or secondarily with international human rights, the survey revealed "a somewhat disappointing situation." Thirty-nine percent of the respondent law schools offer courses primarily concerned with human rights, but only 4.5 percent of social science departments present such courses. The researchers concluded that international human rights education "enjoys a legitimacy at the college level, but that its realization is handicapped by competing commitments and scarce resources."[37]

For social studies teachers and educators with an interest in global education, these findings are discouraging. Most social studies teachers receive their content training in social science departments (including history). The survey reveals that only one in twenty social science departments in higher education offers even one course in international human rights.

In order for international human rights in the context of education for a global perspective to become a long-term reality in general education, global education itself must become institutionalized at the college and university level. Colleges of Education can and should exert leadership within higher education in order to advance the purposes of education for a global perspective utilizing international human rights as a cornerstone; colleges of education stand at the intersection of the need for change in both the schools and in the universities.

A Fresh Approach to Teacher Education

Program development in global education, including international human rights, stands in sharp contrast with the packaged curriculum movement of the 1960s and 1970s. The new math, science, and social studies were all developed apart from local school settings. Curriculum change at the local school level depended upon dissemination models that emphasized the importing of "expert" knowledge into settings where teachers, parents, and the community were largely "uninformed." Lacking any sustained and deep commitment at the local level, these curriculum projects failed to bring about the significant changes that had been hoped, and were shelved.

By contrast, global education appears to be most successful where scholars, educators, parents, and community leaders combine their human, material, and political resources at the local level. Global education is best conceived as a grass roots activity. It has a potential for releasing human energies and resources to a degree unknown in the era of packaged curriculum because people can understand the need and can become productively involved in their own settings. This local nature of global education requires, however, that university educators reexamine assumptions about program development and take a fresh approach to teacher training.

Staff development and teacher education in global education should be conceived as a broad change process. College professors need to see themselves as agents of change in the community -- as developers of networks who require interpersonal and political skills as well as content knowledge. Local networking is critical for the long-term success of global education. Federal and state grants in support of global education are extremely helpful, but they are most effective when used to support an existing network at the local level. Fortunately,

these local networks and commitments appear to be increasing, thus promising that global education will make fundamental changes in education in the United States, rather than reflecting a passing fancy of a few hardy visionaries. Global education, including international human rights, is here to stay; indeed, universities may have to run to catch up. Teacher educators have an opportunity and a special responsibility to marshal the energies of the grass roots agencies and actors into productive and useful programs in education for a global perspective.

Postscript

The developmental task in education for a global perspective requires educators to be determined realists. That spirit is expressed well in a parable shared by a global educator from Holland who has spent his university career in teaching a global perspective.

The Story of the Three Flies

Three flies sat on the brink of a glass filled with milk. Fly number one falls into the milk and thinks: "I can't get out of here." It doesn't move, and gets drowned. It is the pessimist. The second fly is the optimist. It thinks: "What could happen to me? It is all very easy." It begins to move wildly and has its body covered with milk very soon. This fly also disappears to the bottom of the glass. The third fly is aware of the seriousness of the situation, yet does not want to surrender without a trial to survive. It therefore thinks first what to do. Subsequently it begins to "tread milk." The result is that after some time it gets solid ground under its feet. It has churned butter! The last fly is the realist who tries to view things in their real proportions and so has the best chance to survive.[38]

For global educators, the challenge of education for social reconstruction and preparation for a paradigm change requires the patient characteristics of the realistic fly.

Notes

1. Herbert J. Muller, The Uses of the Past. New York: Oxford University Press, 1952.

2. Lee F. Anderson, "The Emergence of a World System Paradigm in Social Science Scolarship and Education," n.d., mimeo.

3. Leften S. Stavrianos, Global Rift: The Third World Comes of Age. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1981.

4. John Chapman, James W. Becker, M. Eugene Gilliom, and Jan Tucker, "Position Statement on Global Education," Social Education. 48:1 (January 1982) 36-38.

5. James W. Botkin, Mahdi Elmandjra, Mircea Maltiza, No Limits to Learning: Bridging the Human Gap. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1979.

6. Jeremy Rifkin, Entropy: A New World View. New York: The Viking Press, 1980.

7. Robert L. Heilbroner, The Great Ascent: The Struggle for Economic Development in Our Time. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1963, pp 9-10.

8. Barbara Ward, The Home of Man. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1976, pp. 258-268.

9. Edwin O. Reischauer, Toward the 21st Century: Education for a Changing World. New York: Vintage Books, 1974.

10. Thomas Buergenthal and Judith V. Torney, International Human Rights and International Education. Washington, D. C.: U. S. National Commission for UNESCO, Department of State, 1976 (available from Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office); Paul Williams, ed., The International Bill of Human Rights. Glen Ellen, California: Entwhistle Books, 1981.

11. This discussion regarding the 1978 UNESCO general conference is based upon the author's notes taken at the December 1978 meeting of the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO, Washington, D. C., 1978.

12. Robert L. Heilbroner, An Inquiry into the Human Prospect. New York: W. W. Norton, Inc., 1974, p. 131.

13. Ibid., pp. 135-136.

14. George S. Counts, Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order? New York, 1932.

15. Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957. New York: Vintage Books, 1961, p. 259.

16. R. Freeman Butts and Lawrence A. Cremin, A History of Education in American Culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953, p. 508.

17. Cremin, op. cit., p. 264.

18. Robert S. Lynd, Knowledge for What? Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1939.

19. Cremin, op. cit., p. 270.

20. Donald W. Oliver, "Reflections on Peter Carbone's The Social and Educational Thought of Harold Rugg," Social Education 42:7 (November-December 1978) pp. 593-597.

21. "What Should Be Known of International Politics in the U. S.?" Editorial, Diario Las Americas, Miami, Florida, January 10, 1979.

22. Lee F. Anderson, Schooling and Citizenship in a Global Age: An Exploration of the Meaning and Significance of Global Education. Bloomington, Indiana: Social Studies Development Center, Indiana University, 1979.

23. James M. Becker, Education for a Global Society. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1973.

24. Robert Leestma, "Global Education," American Education, June 1978, pp. 6-13.

25. Buergenthal and Torney, op. cit.

26. Robert W. Johns, "Man-in-Dialogue: An Image for Global-Minded Citizenship," Theory and Research in Social Education 6:2 (June 1978) pp. 1-25.

27. Robert G. Hanvey, An Attainable Global Perspective, New York: Center for Global Perspectives (originally published by the Center for War/Peace Studies), n.d.

28. Cyrus R. Vance, "U. S. Foreign Policy: Constructive Change," Vital Speeches of the Day, 1980, pp. 568-572.

29. Buergenthal and Torney, op. cit., p. 156.

30. Richard Butwell, "Why Don't Americans Study Anyone Else?" The Christian Science Monitor, May 28, 1980, p. 22.

31. Rose Lee Hayden, "The World and You: Global Education is Answer," International Brief Series No. 6, 1979, Town Affiliation Association of the U. S., Inc., Suite 424-26, 1625 Eye Streey, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20006.

32. Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U. S. Capability, A Report to the President from the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office (Stock No. 017-080-02065-3) 1979.

33. U. S. Commissioner of Education Task Force on Global Education: Report with Recommendations. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Education, 1979.

34. H. Con. Res. 301 (96th Congress, 2nd Session, November 19, 1980).

35. George W. Bonham, "Education and the World View," Education and World View. New Rochelle, New York: Change Magazine Press, 1980, pp. 6-14; Don Bonker, "Human Rights: Will Reagan Learn from Congress?" The Christian Science Monitor, February 25, 1981, p. 23; Barbara B. Burn, Expanding the International Dimension of Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980; Maurice Harari, Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus: Guidelines for AASCU Institutions. Washington, D. C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1981; Richard D. Lambert, ed., New Directions in International Education, The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 449. Philadelphia: AAPSS, May 1980; National Assembly on Foreign Language and International Studies, Toward Education with a Global Perspective. Washington, D. C.: Association of American Colleges, 1981; Paul Simon, The Tongue-Tied American: Confronting the Foreign Language Crisis. New York: Continuum, 1980; Marvin Williamson and Cynthia T. Morehouse, eds., International/Intercultural Education in the Four-Year College: A Handbook on Strategies for Change, Occasional Publication No. 22. Albany, New York: The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department Foreign Area Materials Center and Council for Intercultural Studies and Programs, April 1977.

36. Bonham, op. cit., p. 10.

37. Richard P. Claude, Rick Krechewsky and Jeffrey Love, "Teaching International Human Rights: The State of the Art," News for Teachers of Political Science, American Political Science Association, 27 (Fall 1980) pp. 1+ 15-17.

38. Steven C. Derksen, Co-operator, UNESCO Center, Amsterdam, Netherlands.